



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,640	09/21/2006	Marc Lemaire	1022702-000281	2919
21839 7590 01/25/2010 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404				
EXAMINER NWAONICHA, CHUKWUMA O				
ART UNIT 1621		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 01/25/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/539,640

**Applicant(s)**

LEMAIRE ET AL.

**Examiner**

CHUKWUMA O. NWAONICHA

**Art Unit**

1621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 65-68, 74, 94, 96-116 and 133-139 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 117-132 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 65-68, 74, 94, 96-116 and 133-139 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Current Status***

1. This action is responsive to Applicants' amendment of 29 September 2009.
2. Receipt and entry of Applicants' amendment is acknowledged.
3. Claims 65-68, 74, 94, 96-116 and 133-139 are actively pending.
4. The 103 rejection is withdrawn following Applicants amendment.

**This application is a 371 of PCT/FR03/03782 12/17/2003.**

Newly submitted claims 117-132 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: claims 65-68, 74, 94, 96-116 and 133-139 are drawn to a diphosphine compound of formula 1, a transition metal complex and a process for preparing a metal complex while claims 117-132 are drawn to a polymer and the process for preparing the same, and these are two different inventions.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 117-132 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject

matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148


USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 65-68, 74, 94, 96-116 and 133-139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemaire et al., {WO 2000049028 same as U.S. 6,610,875}


Applicants claim a diphosphine compound of formula 1, a transition metal complex and a process for preparing a metal complex; wherein all the variables are as defined in the claims.



formula 1

**Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (M.P.E.P. §2141.01)**

Lemaire et al. teach a diphosphine compounds of the general formulas 2 wherein the variable A is an optionally substituted naphthly, a transition metal complex and a process for preparing a metal complex. See columns 1, 10 and 11 and the working examples.



formula 2

**Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (M.P.E.P., §2141.02)**

Applicants claimed diphosphine compound of formula 1 differs from the diphosphine compounds taught by Lemaire et al. in that applicants claimed diphosphine compound is an isomer (positional isomer) of those taught by prior art reference cited. Lemaire et al. teach a diphosphine compound of formula 2 wherein the variable A is an optionally substituted naphthly at any position of the naphthalene ring while Applicants claim a diphosphine compound of formula 1 wherein binaphthly group is substituted at the X<sub>1</sub> and X<sub>2</sub> positions.

**Finding of prima facie obviousness--rational and motivation (M.P.E.P., §2142-2143)**

The instantly claimed diphosphine compound of formula 1 would have been suggested to one of ordinary skill because one of ordinary skill wishing to produce a reactive catalyst is taught to select the catalyst from the genus of Lemaire et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have a reasonable expectation of success in practicing the instant invention by varying the substituents in the binaphthyl molecule of Lemaire et al. to arrive at the instantly claimed diphosphine compound of formula 1 for producing polymeric products. Said person would have been motivated to practice the teaching of the reference cited because diphosphine compounds are useful in organic synthesis. Additionally, the prior arts substituted diphosphine compounds are isomers of the claimed substituted diphosphine compounds of the general formula 1, and isomers are obvious because of their similar physical and chemical properties. The instantly claimed invention would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants' amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chukwuma O. Nwaonicha whose telephone number is 571-272-2908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Sullivan can be reached on 571-272-0779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Chukwuma O. Nwaonicha/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1621

(for) /Sikarl A. Witherspoon/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1621

Daniel Sullivan  
Supervisory Patent Examiner,  
Technology Center 1600